

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,296	04/20/2004	Michael B. Zemel	31894-202098	2568
26694 7590 12/18/2006 VENABLE LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 34385			WEBMAN, EDWARD J	
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/18/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/827,296	ZEMEL ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Edward J. Webman	1616		
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHOF WHICH - Extensic after SIX - If NO pe - Failure t Any repl	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' EVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Do ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. oriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v oreply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute y received by the Office later than three months after the mailing oratent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status			•		
2a)□ Tl 3)□ Si	esponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 N</u> his action is FINAL . 2b) This ince this application is in condition for allowards osed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition	of Claims				
4a 5)	laim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application (s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application (s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are rejected. laim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application (s)/are allowed. laim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application (s)/are allowed. laim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application (s)/are withdraw application (s)/are allowed. laim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are rejected. laim(s) 1-7	wn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority und	der 35 U.S.C. & 119				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some colon None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
	•	·			
2) Notice o	f References Cited (PTO-892) f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) o(s)/Mail Date 10/18/06	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te		

Application/Control Number: 10/827,296

Art Unit: 1616

Prosecution is reopened in view of a new ground of rejection:

The election of species requirement over health problems filed 1/4/06 is withdrawn.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-7, 10-14 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,384,087. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims encompass the scope of the instant claims regarding the amount of administered calcium.

Claims 1-7, 10-14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5-6, 28-37, 41-44, 46-53, 55, 57, 59-64 of copending Application No. 10/066057. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other

Application/Control Number: 10/827,296

Art Unit: 1616

not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims encompass the scope of the copending claims regarding BMI value.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-7, 10 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1, the penultimate line, do applicants intend "and" after "woman"? See claims 11 and 14. Appropriate correction is required.

No claims allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Webman whose telephone number is 571-272-0633. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J. Richter, can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/827,296

Art Unit: 1616

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EDWARD WEBMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1500 Page 4